JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CABN 44332) 1 United States Attorney 2 3 BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division 4 5 TAREK J. HELOU (CABN 218225) Assistant United States Attorney 6 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 7 San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-7071 (415) 436-7234 Facsimile: 8 Tarek.J.Helou@usdoj.gov 9 10 Attorneys for Plaintiff 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 12 13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 14 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 15 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CR No. 08-431 PJH 16 17 Plaintiff, STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 3161 18 v. JEREMY CRUZ ESPERANTE, 19 20 Defendant. 21 22 On August 13, 2008, the parties appeared before the Court for a status conference in this case. At that time, the parties requested, and the Court agreed, to exclude all time under the 23 24 Speedy Trial Act between August 13, 2008 and September 10, 2008. The parties represented that the requested continuance was a reasonable amount of time necessary for effective preparation of 25 26 defense counsel. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice 27 served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the 28 defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

1

STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCL. TIME

CR 08-431 PJH

The parties also agreed that if the defendant files a motion on August 27, 2008 and the 1 2 Court hears argument on that motion on September 10, 2008, as contemplated, time should be 3 excluded absent stipulation from August 27, 2008 through the date the Court disposes of the motion. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(F). 4 5 SO STIPULATED: 6 7 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO **United States Attorney** 8 9 10 DATED: August 15, 2008 11 Assistant United States Attorney 12 **DATED:** August 15, 2008 13 DANIEL BLANK Attorney for Defendant JEREMY CRUZ ESPERANTE 14 15 16 For the reasons stated above, the Court finds that exclusion of time from August 13, 2008 17 through September 10, 2008 is warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 18 19 3161(h)(8)(A). Failure to grant the requested continuance would deny the defendant effective 20 preparation of counsel, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. 18 U.S.C. § 21 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). 22 23 SO ORDERED. 24 IT IS SO ORDERED DATED: 8/20/08 25 **MILTON** 26 Judge Phyllis J. Hamilton 27 28

STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCL. TIME

CR 08-431 PJH